

**Corporation for National and Community Service**

**2010 Social Innovation Fund**

**Foundation for a Healthy Kentucky**

**Reviewer Comments – Phase 1**

## **Table of Contents**

**Reviewer Comments – Group 1**

**Section 1**

**Reviewer Comments – Group 2**

**Section 2**

**2010 Social Innovation Fund**

**Foundation for a Healthy Kentucky**

**Section 1 – Reviewer Comments: Group 1**

## SOCIAL INNOVATION FUND 2010

### PANEL CONSENSUS FORM

*Instructions throughout this form are indicated in red.*

**Before you begin, please fill out the Applicant Name and Application ID# in the above header.** This Panel Consensus Form (PCF) is where each panel records its consensus assessment of an application. The completion of this form may be led by any panelist; that individual will be designated the Lead Reviewer (LR). All Expert Reviewers are expected to serve as the LR on at least one application. The consensus assessment should be based on the panel's examination of the full application Narrative, which consists of the following 3 categories:

Category	Percentage	Subcategories
Program Design	45%	A. Goals and Objectives
		B. Use of Evidence
		C. Community Resources
		D. Description of Activities i. Subgranting ii. Technical Assistance and Support
Organizational Capacity	35%	A. Ability to Provide Program Oversight
		B. Ability to Provide Fiscal Oversight
Cost-Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy	20%	A. Budget and Program Design
		B. Match Sources

Panels will utilize Panel Consensus Calls to discuss each application and come to agreement on the content of the Narrative Assessment for each category, the Rating for each category, the Overall Appraisal Statement and the Band in which the application will be placed. When completing this form, the LR should rely on four primary documents: 1) the application being reviewed; 2) the IRW Compilation for the application being reviewed (compiled prior to discussion by the panel Facilitator); 3) the SIF Notice of Federal Funds Availability (NOFA); 4) the Consensus Rubric at the end of this form.

**Please complete the following steps:**

- For each of the 3 categories (Program Design; Organizational Capacity; Cost-Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy), the LR should:
  - Write a 3 – 5 sentence Narrative Assessment** reflecting the panel's assessment of the quality of the response in the category being assessed; it is important that this narrative is not a summary of the application, rather the panel's evaluation of the application's quality.
  - List the application's significant strengths and weaknesses and annotate each.** Each significant strength or weakness **must** be supported by **at least one** of the Eligibility or Application Review Criteria that were in the SIF NOFA. (examples are included in this form)
  - Taking into consideration** both the Narrative Assessment and the listed strengths and weaknesses, **select a Rating** by checking the appropriate box.
- Complete the Overall Appraisal section.** In this section, you will:
  - Provide an Overall Appraisal Statement; and
  - Select a consensus Band that represents the quality of the application as a whole. The Bands are described in the Overall Appraisal section at the end of this form, and Appendix D of the Review Guide
- After the panel has discussed all applications, provide a Rank for each application.**

## **PROGRAM DESIGN (45%)**

---

The Social Innovation Fund Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) states that the following will be considered when reviewing an applicant's Program Design.

### **A. GOALS AND OBJECTIVES**

*The Corporation asks applicants to use a thematic approach in describing their proposed investments in community organizations. As established in the Act, there are two basic operational models of SIF intermediaries. The first is a SIF that will operate in a single geographic location, and address one or more priority issues within that location. This model is referred to as a "geographically-based SIF." The second model is a SIF that will address a single priority issue area in multiple geographic locations. This model is referred to as an "issue-based SIF." The Corporation will assess whether the application properly proposes goals and objectives as either a geographically-based or an issue-based SIF.*

#### **i. Geographically-Based SIF**

*To apply as a geographically-based SIF, the applicant must propose to focus on serving low-income communities within a specific local geographic area, and propose to focus on improving measurable outcomes related to one or more of the following priority issue areas:*

- **Economic Opportunity** – Increasing economic opportunities for economically disadvantaged individuals;
- **Youth Development and School Support** – Preparing America's youth for success in school, active citizenship, productive work, and healthy and safe lives;
- **Healthy Futures** – Promoting healthy lifestyles and reducing the risk factors that can lead to illness.

*The application must provide 1) statistics on the needs related to the issue area(s) within the specific local geographic area, and 2) information on the specific measurable outcomes related to those issue areas that the applicant will seek to improve.*

#### **ii. Issue-Based SIF**

*To apply as an issue-based SIF, the application must propose to focus on addressing one of the following priority issue areas within multiple low-income communities:*

- **Economic Opportunity** – Increasing economic opportunities for economically disadvantaged individuals;
- **Youth Development and School Support** – Preparing America's youth for success in school, active citizenship, productive work, and healthy and safe lives;
- **Healthy Futures** – Promoting healthy lifestyles and reducing the risk factors that can lead to illness.

*The application must provide 1) statistics on the needs related to the issue area within the geographic areas likely to be served, including statistics demonstrating that those geographic*

*areas have a high need in the priority issue area, and 2) information on the specific measurable outcomes related to the priority issue area that the applicant will seek to improve.*

## **B. USE OF EVIDENCE**

- i. *Applicants must include in their application information describing their track record of using rigorous evidence, data, and evaluation tools to:*
- *Select and invest in subgrantees;*
  - *Support and monitor the replication and expansion of subgrantees; and*
  - *Achieve measurable outcomes.*

## **C. COMMUNITY RESOURCES**

Not applicable. The applicant's Community Resources should be assessed in the Cost-Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy section. Applicants were instructed **not** to provide information in this section. If applicants include information in this section, it should not be considered in your overall rating for the Program Design section.

## **D. DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES**

- i. **Subgranting**
- a. *Applicants must describe the process by which they will competitively select their nonprofit community organization subgrantees, and, if applicable, the process by which they have pre-selected some subgrantees. Specifically, applicants must describe how their competitive subgrant selection process will ensure a portfolio of subgrantees that are innovative nonprofit community organizations serving low-income communities and that possess:*
- *A strong theory of change;*
  - *Strong leadership and financial and management systems, including data management;*
  - *A strong financial position, including funding diversity, the ability to meet the requirements for providing dollar-for-dollar matching funds, and the ability to sustain the initiative after the subgrant period concludes;*
  - *Strong community relationships;*
  - *A commitment to and track record of using data and evaluation for performance and program improvement;*
  - *Evidence of effectiveness, including a demonstrated track record of achieving specific measurable outcomes related to the measurable outcomes for the intermediary;*
  - *Strong potential for replication or expansion;*
  - *A well-defined plan for achieving specific measurable outcomes connected to the measurable outcomes for the intermediary, evaluation of program effectiveness, performance improvement, and replication or expansion; and*
  - *A commitment to use grant funds to replicate, expand, or support their programs.*

*Either as part of its review of the applications or in clarification reviews prior to award, the Corporation may request additional information regarding pre-selected subgrantees for compliance and appropriate outcomes.*

**ii. Technical Assistance and Support**

- a. *Applicants must include in their application information describing how they will provide technical assistance and support (other than financial support) that will increase the ability of subgrantees to achieve their measurable outcomes, including replication or expansion. Replication or expansion may happen in various ways (including, for example, creating new sites or affiliating with another program to replicate an intervention) and in multiple contexts (including, for example, serving more people in a current geography or growing to new geographies).*
- 

**Provide a panel assessment of the application's PROGRAM DESIGN as follows:**

- **Write a brief Narrative Assessment;**
  - **List the Significant Strengths and Weaknesses (annotate your comments by referencing the applicable Eligibility or Application Review Criteria); and**
  - **Select a Rating for this section.**
- 

**Panel Narrative Assessment**

In terms of plan design, the applicant describes a commendable process for the selection of subgrantees and the support provided to them to increase their chances of success. The applicant has also put in place a strong evaluation component to improve grantee performance and overall program effectiveness. The strength of the plan design, however, is outweighed by the lack of evidence. Past accomplishments and expectations to expand are described without providing sufficient detail.

**Significant Strengths**

The applicant provides current statistical data specific to both their geographic area of interest, as well as nationally (p.6-7) (Program Design A.i).

The applicant has research and evaluation support through its contractual relationship with a national research firm, CCHE, with local and national experts in the field of health evaluation who serve on the applicant's Advisory Board. In addition, the applicant has committed 10% of its budget to evaluation expenditures (p.10-11;13;31). (Plan Design B.ii.).

The applicant details a rigorous process for subgrantee selection, including a strong theory of change, strong leadership and fiscal management, strong community ties, a plan for sustainability beyond the grant period and a defined evaluation plan (p.15-16). (Program Design D.ia.)

The applicant cites a plan and a track record for guiding subgrantees to collect and analyze data to achieve outcomes and to guide other local initiatives toward successful replication of results (p.24) (Program Design D.ii.a.)

The applicant demonstrates a clear commitment to support its subgrantees in achieving measurable outcomes (including replication and expansion) and developing evaluation plans to improve performance, as evidenced by the provision of: quarterly workshops and webinars, individualized technical assistance, data, and loan guarantees (p.3;10;18;21). (Program Design B.i.; Program Design D.i.a.; Program Design D.ii.)

**Significant Weaknesses**

Although the applicant supports and monitors its subgrantees in numerous ways (see significant strength above), little to no evidence is cited for the achievement of measurable outcomes (p.2; 10). (Program Design B.i.).

While the applicant intends to apply a range of data analytic strategies from quantitative health outcomes to qualitative experiential self-reporting, most of the analyses appear to function on a descriptive level versus specific plans to measure results that demonstrate improved population health outcomes.(Program Design B.i.).

While the applicant has a history of working to promote positive outcomes in several low-income and rural communities, the applicant mentions a number of successes without ever describing the health outcomes that were measured (P.31). (Program Design A.i.).

**Select a Rating for PROGRAM DESIGN** (double-click in the applicable box and select "checked")

☐ Excellent

☐ Strong

☒ Satisfactory

☐ Weak/Non-responsive

---

## **ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY (35%)**

---

The **Social Innovation Fund NOFA** states that the following will be considered when reviewing an applicant's Organizational Capacity.

### **A. ABILITY TO PROVIDE PROGRAM OVERSIGHT**

*In evaluating your organization's ability to provide program oversight, the Corporation will consider:*

- i. *The extent to which your organization has a sound structure including:*
  - *The ability to provide sound programmatic oversight, including:*
    - *Experience with and capacity for evaluation; and*
    - *Experience with and capacity for supporting replication or expansion.*
  - *Well-defined roles for your Board of directors, administrators, and staff;*
  - *A well-designed plan and systems for organizational (as opposed to subgrantee) self-assessment and continuous improvement; and*
  - *The ability to provide and/or secure effective technical assistance.*
- ii. *Whether your organization has a sound record of accomplishment, including the extent to which you:*
  - *Have a track record of supporting organizations that demonstrate evidence of impact;*
  - *Demonstrate leadership within the organization and strong relationships within the communities served;*
  - *Have a track-record of raising substantial resources, and, if you are an existing Federal grantee, having secured the matching resources as required in your prior grant awards; and*
  - *The extent to which your community support recurs, increases in scope or amount, and is more diverse, as evidenced by:*
    - *Collaborations that include a diverse spectrum of community stakeholders;*
    - *A broad base of financial support, including local financial and in-kind contributions; and*
    - *Supporters who represent a wide range of community stakeholders.*



## **B. ABILITY TO PROVIDE FISCAL OVERSIGHT**

*Entities eligible to apply for SIF grants include:*

- Existing grantmaking institutions, or
  - Partnerships between an existing grantmaking institution and another grantmaking institution, a State Commission, or the chief executive officer of a unit of general local government
- i. Existing grantmaking institutions are organizations in existence at the time of the application where, investing in nonprofit community organizations or programs is an essential (rather than collateral) means of fulfilling their mission and vision. In keeping with this view, grantmaking institutions will generally have the following as part of their core operating functions:
- Conducting open or otherwise competitive programs to award grants to or make investments in a diverse portfolio of nonprofit community organizations;
  - Negotiating specific grant requirements with nonprofit community organizations; and
  - Overseeing and monitoring the performance of grantees.
- ii. In evaluating your organization's ability to provide fiscal oversight, the Corporation will take into account its review of your organization's capacity. The Corporation will further consider:
- The extent to which your organization, or proposed partnership, has key personnel with the knowledge, skills, abilities, and experience to provide fiscal oversight of subgrantees; and
  - Whether your organization, or proposed partnership, has specific experience in providing fiscal oversight of subgrantees of Federal funds.

---

**Provide a panel assessment of the application's ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY as follows:**

- Write a brief Narrative Assessment;
  - List the Significant Strengths and Weaknesses (annotate your comments by referencing the applicable Eligibility or Application Review Criteria); and
  - Select a Rating for this section.
- 

### **Panel Narrative Assessment**

The applicant has a small staff and is dependent on an array of local, state and national organizations and consultants to assist in oversight, training, support and evaluation, both at the local grantee and state level. Although the applicant will hire another program officer if awarded this grant, there is a concern that the applicant does not have sufficient staff resources to manage the increased funding (the SIF request represents an increase of a third in terms of total grant making funds).

### **Significant Strengths**

The applicant has developed a strong partnership with the state health agency as evidenced by a Foundation-funded data analyst working in the Kentucky State Data Center (p.22; 28); the funding of a website ([www.kyhealthfacts.org](http://www.kyhealthfacts.org)) that serves as a health data resource for all Kentucky; and sponsoring targeted research and forums (p.5). (Organizational Capacity A.i.).

The applicant has forged new relationships with in and outside the state to advance their mission, as evidenced by: Collaborative Family Health Care Association; Kentucky Dietetic Association, Center for Health Equity and Kentucky's new state Office of Health Equity, among others (p.29). (Organizational Capacity, A.ii)

### Significant Weaknesses

The applicant is primarily a grant maker and has never managed a Federal Grant (p.30; 39). (Organizational Capacity A.ii.).

Though the applicant staff is small (staff of 6- p.3), the applicant only intends to hire one additional Program Officer despite the grant making budget increasing by a third (p.2;38) (Organizational Capacity A.i.)

The applicant does not clearly detail or outline the extent to which its community support recurs, increases in scope and is more diverse through collaborations and a broad base of financial support, including in-kind contributions (p.23-24). (Organizational Capacity A.ii.)

**Select a Rating for ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY** (double-click in the applicable box and select "checked")

☐ Excellent

☐ Strong

☒ Satisfactory

☐ Weak/Non-responsive

## **COST EFFECTIVENESS AND BUDGET ADEQUACY (20%)**

The **Social Innovation Fund NOFA** states that the following will be considered when reviewing an applicant's Cost-Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy.

### **A. BUDGET AND PROGRAM DESIGN**

*In evaluating the cost effectiveness and budget adequacy of your proposed program, the Corporation will consider:*

- i. *Whether your program is cost-effective based on:*
  - *The extent to which your program demonstrates diverse, non-Federal resources for program implementation and sustainability;*
  - *The extent to which you are proposing to provide more than the minimum required share of the costs of your program; and*
  - *Whether the reasonable and necessary costs of your program or project are higher because you are proposing to serve areas that are significantly philanthropically underserved.*
- ii. *Whether your budget is adequate to support your program design.*

### **B. MATCH SOURCES**

- i. *At the time of submission of the application, applicants must demonstrate either cash-on-hand or commitments (or a combination thereof) toward meeting 50 percent their first year matching funds, based on the amount of Federal grant funds applied for.*

- ii. *In addition to the match eligibility criteria, the Corporation will evaluate the extent to which you have a combination of cash-on-hand or commitments to meet the full match requirements, and whether your organization will be able to provide financial resources for your SIF program beyond the minimum required match.*

**Provide a panel assessment of the application's COST-EFFECTIVENESS AND BUDGET ADEQUACY as follows:**

- **Write a brief Narrative Assessment;**
- **List the Significant Strengths and Weaknesses (annotate your comments by referencing the applicable Eligibility or Application Review Criteria); and**
- **Select a Rating for this section.**

---

**Panel Narrative Assessment**

The applicant has funded over \$10 million in grants over the last eight years and nearly all funding has come from their endowment. The applicant clearly has the resources to match the SIF requirements (net assets of over \$52 million and an annual grants budget of \$2-\$2.5 million). Further, the applicant has resources that should allow it to provide funding beyond the match.

**Significant Strengths**

The applicant is fiscally sound, as evidenced by its ability to provide the full matching funds from its endowment and having sufficient cash-on-hand (p. 38 and 39). (Cost Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy B. i., ii.).

The applicant's proposed budget to expand its selection of and support for subgrantees over several years appear to fully cover program design costs. (Cost Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy A.ii.).

**Significant Weaknesses**

None

**Select a Rating for COST-EFFECTIVENESS AND BUDGET ADEQUACY** (double-click in the applicable box and select "checked")

☐ Excellent

☒ Strong

☐ Satisfactory

☐ Weak/Non-responsive

---

**OVERALL APPRAISAL**

**I. Provide a 3 - 5 sentence Overall Appraisal Statement of the application taking into consideration:**

- The Narrative Assessments, significant strengths and weaknesses, and Ratings from each category; and
- The weighting of each category (Program Design (45%), Organizational Capacity (35%), Cost-Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy (20%)).

Applicant Name: Foundation for a Healthy Kentucky  
Application ID#: 10S/116273

---

The applicant does not clearly delineate a plan of action. Instead, the applicant describes historic accomplishments and an expectation to expand without providing much specific evidence or detail.

The applicant provides good stewardship and mentoring of small local agencies toward evidence-based programming, outcomes measurement and sustainability while being sensitive to local circumstances.

The applicant relies heavily on outside organizations and consultants to assist them and its subgrantees.

The applicant, however, is fiscally sound and can provide the full matching funds from its endowment. The applicant also appears to have sufficient cash-on-hand.

**II. Select one Band for this application (double-click in the applicable box and select "checked")**

**Ensure that your selection is supported by your panel's Narrative Assessments, significant strengths and weaknesses, Ratings, and Overall Appraisal Statement. Take into consideration the weighting of each category.**

- ☐ **Band I (Excellent):** A comprehensive and thorough application of excellent merit with very significant strengths and no/minimal significant weaknesses.
  - ☐ **Band II (Strong):** An application that demonstrates overall competence and is worthy of support, where the value of the significant strengths outweigh the identified weaknesses.
  - ☒ **Band III (Satisfactory):** An application with potential, where strengths and weaknesses are approximately equal. However, some fundamental weaknesses have been identified.
  - ☐ **Band IV (Weak/Non-Responsive):** An application with very significant weaknesses and no/minimal significant strengths that have been identified. This option may also include an application that is non-responsive to the published criteria.
- 

## Rank

**As a panel, Rank this application in relation to the other applications on your panel.** Complete this section only after all applications before your panel have been reviewed and consensus has been achieved on each one. The highest rank is "1".

**Rank: 4 of 6 total applications on Panel # 1.**

## CONSENSUS RUBRIC

Please use this Consensus Rubric as guidance when selecting your Ratings or Bands.

**BAND I (Excellent)** — *A BAND I rating reflects that the application is compelling, consistently excellent in quality, and addresses all requirements; thereby showing the highest potential for success.*

The **Excellent** application consistently:

- ✓ Goes beyond what was requested, showing that the applicant has anticipated issues that may arise.
- ✓ Provides a thorough, detailed response to all of the information requested.
- ✓ Provides a clear and highly compelling description of how the proposed activities will achieve the anticipated results.
- ✓ Provides clear evidence to support all objectives of this section (no assumptions are made).
- ✓ Supports ideas and objectives with comprehensive plans explaining and connecting ideas to objectives.

**BAND II (Strong)** — *A BAND II rating reflects that the application is solid, good-quality, and has great potential for success.*

The **Strong** application:

- ✓ Provides a response to all of the information requested.
- ✓ Provides a realistic description of how the proposed activities will achieve the anticipated results.
- ✓ Explains most assumptions and reasons.
- ✓ Supports ideas with comprehensive plans, examples, or outlines.

**BAND III (Satisfactory)** — *A BAND III rating reflects that the application generally meets requirements for a reasonable chance of success, but is neither especially strong nor especially weak.*

The **Satisfactory** application:

- ✓ Covers most of the information requested, with a few exceptions.
- ✓ Is sometimes unclear how the proposed activities will achieve the anticipated results.
- ✓ Makes some assumptions and leaves some reasons unexplained.
- ✓ Supports individual ideas with plans, examples, or outline.

**BAND IV (Weak/Non-responsive)** — *A weak/non-responsive rating reflects that the application is below standard especially in ability, skill, or quality; indicating that this application will most likely not succeed as described or is not responsive to the application requirements.*

The **Weak/Non-responsive** application:

- ✓ Does not provide one or more key pieces of requested information.
- ✓ Gives an unclear description of how the proposed activities will achieve the anticipated results.
- ✓ Gives many unsupported assumptions and reasons with little or no connection to objectives.
- ✓ Tends to "parrot" back the question, rather than answer and explain it
- ✓ Makes many assumptions and many reasons are not defined.
- ✓ Did not connect the activities to the anticipated results.

Applicant Name: Foundation for a Healthy Kentucky  
Application ID#: 10S/116273

---

- ✓ Does not address or respond to the requirements/conditions of the NOFA.
- ✓ Proposes activities that are not consistent with the NOFA and application instructions.

**2010 Social Innovation Fund**

**Foundation for a Healthy Kentucky**

**Section 2 – Reviewer Comments: Group 2**

## SOCIAL INNOVATION FUND 2010 PANEL CONSENSUS FORM

*Instructions throughout this form are indicated in red.*

**Before you begin, please fill out the Applicant Name and Application ID# in the above header.** This Panel Consensus Form (PCF) is where each panel records its consensus assessment of an application. The completion of this form may be led by any panelist; that individual will be designated the Lead Reviewer (LR). All Expert Reviewers are expected to serve as the LR on at least one application. The consensus assessment should be based on the panel's examination of the full application Narrative, which consists of the following 3 categories:

Category	Percentage	Subcategories
Program Design	45%	A. Goals and Objectives
		B. Use of Evidence
		C. Community Resources
		D. Description of Activities i. Subgranting ii. Technical Assistance and Support
Organizational Capacity	35%	A. Ability to Provide Program Oversight
		B. Ability to Provide Fiscal Oversight
Cost-Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy	20%	A. Budget and Program Design
		B. Match Sources

Panels will utilize Panel Consensus Calls to discuss each application and come to agreement on the content of the Narrative Assessment for each category, the Rating for each category, the Overall Appraisal Statement and the Band in which the application will be placed. When completing this form, the LR should rely on four primary documents: 1) the application being reviewed; 2) the IRW Compilation for the application being reviewed (compiled prior to discussion by the panel Facilitator); 3) the SIF Notice of Federal Funds Availability (NOFA); 4) the Consensus Rubric at the end of this form.

**Please complete the following steps:**

- For each of the 3 categories (Program Design; Organizational Capacity; Cost-Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy), the LR should:
  - Write a 3 – 5 sentence Narrative Assessment** reflecting the panel's assessment of the quality of the response in the category being assessed; it is important that this narrative is not a summary of the application, rather the panel's evaluation of the application's quality.
  - List the application's significant strengths and weaknesses and annotate each.** Each significant strength or weakness **must** be supported by **at least one** of the Eligibility or Application Review Criteria that were in the SIF NOFA. (examples are included in this form)
  - Taking into consideration** both the Narrative Assessment and the listed strengths and weaknesses, **select a Rating** by checking the appropriate box.
- Complete the Overall Appraisal section.** In this section, you will:
  - Provide an Overall Appraisal Statement; and
  - Select a consensus Band that represents the quality of the application as a whole. The Bands are described in the Overall Appraisal section at the end of this form, and Appendix D of the Review Guide.
- After the panel has discussed all applications, provide a Rank for each application.**



## **PROGRAM DESIGN (45%)**

---

**Provide a panel assessment of the application's PROGRAM DESIGN as follows:**

- **Write a brief Narrative Assessment;**
  - **List the Significant Strengths and Weaknesses (annotate your comments by referencing the applicable Eligibility or Application Review Criteria); and**
  - **Select a Rating for this section.**
- 

### **Panel Narrative Assessment**

The applicant is an existing, five-year old grant making organization that emerged from the privatization of the Kentucky Blue Cross/Blue Shield organization. It is proposing a geographically-based healthy futures SIF to identify and support local nonprofit organizations in Kentucky, as they develop innovative, replicable strategies to improve the health of rural and low-income communities drawing on "local wisdom" and knowledge of local customs, mores, and sensitivities. The applicant has considerable experience utilizing this approach and a solid track-record of accomplishments with it. Especially notable is its coherent "phased" approach consisting of initial planning steps during which potential grantees are asked to develop a business plan, performance metrics, and a strategy for sustainability before moving to the phase of full-scale support.

### **Significant Strengths**

- Interesting model drawing on "local wisdom" to design workable intervention strategies (*D.i.a.*)
- Proposes use of combination of grants, technical assistance, training for community groups (*D.*)
- Proposes sensible phased investment approach starting with initial planning grants leading to operational funding upon demonstrated progress in designing business plan, formulating evaluation metrics, and starting implementation (*D.ii.a.*)
- Consciously searching for "next big idea" in health promotion (*A.ii.*)
- Good use of evidence make the case for need for intervention (*B.i*)
- Strong commitment to use of metrics to measure outcomes (*B.i*)
- Engagement of qualified outside evaluation organization—Center for Community and Health Evaluation-- to conduct evaluation and instruct grantees in evaluation design and execution (*B.i*)
- Use of "participatory evaluation" methodology to connect evaluation to community groups (*B.i*)
- Strong track record of applicant in using evaluation in prior programs—e.g. Local Data for Local Action initiative (*B.i*)
- Applicant commits to providing substantial technical assistance to subgrantees, for example, using "group training (workshops and seminars), individualized (site specific) TA, funding and promoting availability of data" (page 21) and connecting grantees through established applicant relationships with "locally and nationally known providers" appropriate to subgrantee needs. (*D.ii.a.*)
- Clear presentation of process and outcomes desired (*B.i*)
- Board's requirement of 10% of funds for evaluation suggests institutional history and very solid commitment to learning from evaluation (*Program Design B.i*)

Applicant Name: Foundation for a Healthy Kentucky  
Application ID#: 10SI1162373

- Solid and persuasive list of criteria through which to choose sub-grantees, including required “strong community relationships” (*D.i.a.*)
- Benchmarks for multi-year continuity clear and applicant presents evidence demonstrating that foundation has experience with this approach (*Program Design D.i.a.*)
- Extensive network from which to solicit potential subgrantees with promising ideas (*D.i.a.*)

### Significant Weaknesses

- Types of ideas that might qualify for assistance not elaborated at all (*D.i.a.*)
- Applicant identifies the four priority areas where it expects subgrantees to design measurable outcomes, but does not prescribe specific numbers desirable for subgrantees to strive to achieve that will move Kentucky out of 41<sup>st</sup> place and toward a higher health status nationally (*A.i.*)
- Indicators of progress seem tilted toward process and output indicators (e.g. number of smoke-free businesses, coalition formation, connections with other community agencies) (p. 8) as opposed to outcome indicators (*A.i. and B.i.*)
- Plan for organization of technical assistance seems a bit hit-or-miss. Until late in the proposal it seems that foundation staff would be doing this. But then a broad array of consultants mentioned, but in passing. Not sufficiently developed given the emphasis placed on this in the proposal (*D.ii.a.*)

Select a Rating for PROGRAM DESIGN (double-click in the applicable box and select “checked”)

☐ Excellent

☒ Strong

☐ Satisfactory

☐ Weak/Non-responsive

## ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY (35%)

Provide a panel assessment of the application’s ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY as follows:

- Write a brief Narrative Assessment;
- List the Significant Strengths and Weaknesses (annotate your comments by referencing the applicable Eligibility or Application Review Criteria); and
- Select a Rating for this section.

### Panel Narrative Assessment

The applicant organization displays an impressive record of accomplishment in promoting healthy outcomes for Kentucky residents. The organization seems well centered, with an active board and an internal staff that displays impressive professional credentials in the health field. The Foundation has developed an interesting phased approach to its grant-making that ties subsequent support to clear organizational markers. It has also developed a fruitful partnership with an external evaluation firm with skills in both health promotion and assessing community-based engagement. Some concerns were raised about the lack of experience in dealing with federal grants and the somewhat unclear plan for engaging other technical assistance providers.

### Significant Strengths

- Solid track record of prior accomplishments in health promotion field through a series of initiatives such as the Local Data/Local Action program and several other successful ventures to promote positive changes in health outcomes for KY residents (*A.ii.*)
- Apparent strong Board involvement, sensible Board committee structure, and strong Board support for strategy being promoted (*A.i*)
- Capable executive staff with strong background in health improvement work, suggesting Board's commitment to strong, effective, and substantive leadership (*A.i*)
- Applicant shows throughout the proposal a commitment to rigor in moving subgrantees toward achieving measurable outcomes, periodic course adjustments based on internal and external analysis and amassed evidence, and continuing professional assessment by qualified internal staff and external consultants of grantee progress and capability. (*Organizational Capacity A.ii.*)
- Applicant cites numerous examples of impact from past foundation grant investments (pages 11, 16, 20, 24, 25, 30, 32). (*Organizational Capacity A.ii.*)
- Applicant gives evidence throughout proposal of what it looks for in seeking grants that have "impact potential" including measurement rigor, subgrantee knowledge of local conditions, subgrantee health knowledge, ties by subgrantee organizations to local communities, clear subgrantee grasp of a theory of action derived from a logic model, and organizational "readiness" to move toward measurable outcomes (page 18-19). (*Organizational Capacity A.ii.*)
- Strong record of use of evaluation in program assessment and internal guidance (*A.ii.*)
- Interesting model of phased engagement with grantees based on grantee performance—useful for engaging with indigenous communities;
- Extensive track record of major institutional investment in evaluation and learning as reflected in established partnership with the Center for Community and Health Evaluation on four prior occasions (pages 3, 10) and commitment to this same arrangement in working with SIF subgrantees. (*Organizational Capacity A.i.*)

### Significant Weaknesses

- Foundation has not yet administered a Federal Grant, though its ED has at other organizations (*B.i*)
- Organizational capacity-building capabilities of staff not clear (*A.i*)
- Capabilities and basis for selection of technical assistance providers not clear yet these are critical to the program design (*A.i*)

Select a Rating for ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY (double-click in the applicable box and select "checked")

☐ Excellent

☒ Strong

☐ Satisfactory

☐ Weak/Non-responsive

## COST EFFECTIVENESS AND BUDGET ADEQUACY (20%)

The Social Innovation Fund NOFA states that the following will be considered when reviewing an applicant's Cost-Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy.

### A. BUDGET AND PROGRAM DESIGN

*In evaluating the cost effectiveness and budget adequacy of your proposed program, the Corporation will consider:*

- i. *Whether your program is cost-effective based on:*
  - *The extent to which your program demonstrates diverse, non-Federal resources for program implementation and sustainability;*
  - *The extent to which you are proposing to provide more than the minimum required share of the costs of your program; and*
  - *Whether the reasonable and necessary costs of your program or project are higher because you are proposing to serve areas that are significantly philanthropically underserved.*
- ii. *Whether your budget is adequate to support your program design.*

#### **B. MATCH SOURCES**

- i. *At the time of submission of the application, applicants must demonstrate either cash-on-hand or commitments (or a combination thereof) toward meeting 50 percent their first year matching funds, based on the amount of Federal grant funds applied for.*
- ii. *In addition to the match eligibility criteria, the Corporation will evaluate the extent to which you have a combination of cash-on-hand or commitments to meet the full match requirements, and whether your organization will be able to provide financial resources for your SIF program beyond the minimum required match.*

---

**Provide a panel assessment of the application's COST-EFFECTIVENESS AND BUDGET ADEQUACY as follows:**

- **Write a brief Narrative Assessment;**
- **List the Significant Strengths and Weaknesses (annotate your comments by referencing the applicable Eligibility or Application Review Criteria); and**
- **Select a Rating for this section.**

---

#### **Panel Narrative Assessment**

The applicant has presented a clear and transparent budget without the gimmicks evident in some other proposals reviewed. It splits all relevant costs with the SIF, which seems appropriate to this set of reviewers. Staff salaries appear reasonable as does the amount set aside for evaluation. On the other hand, the amount allocated for technical assistance does not seem consistent with the emphasis placed on this item in the narrative and the computation of overhead is difficult to understand. The applicant has located the necessary match.

#### **Significant Strengths**

- Clear and transparent budget with no gimmicks—splits all relevant costs with SIF (A.i.)
- Ample funding for evaluation activities (A.ii.)
- Staff salaries reasonable (A.ii.)
- Applicant has met match requirement through commitment of funds from its endowment and indicates possibilities of additional funds forthcoming, possibly directly to subgrantees, from other

funders including community foundations in areas where sub-grantees operate. (*Cost Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy B.i.*)

### Significant Weaknesses

- Not clear how many grantees anticipated so hard to judge budget (*A.ii.*)
- Amount shown in budget for technical assistance (\$48,000) does not seem consistent with the heavy emphasis placed on this in the proposal (*A.ii.*)
- Claims overhead of 29 percent on direct costs, but with \$360,000 of direct costs this should amount to \$104,400, not the \$23,200 shown. Applicant deserves praise for noting indirect costs, but has not computed them as indicated.

**Select a Rating for COST-EFFECTIVENESS AND BUDGET ADEQUACY** (double-click in the applicable box and select "checked")

☐ Excellent

☐ Strong

☒ Satisfactory

☐ Weak/Non-responsive

## OVERALL APPRAISAL

### I. Provide a 3 - 5 sentence Overall Appraisal Statement of the application taking into consideration:

- The Narrative Assessments, significant strengths and weaknesses, and Ratings from each category; and
- The weighting of each category (Program Design (45%), Organizational Capacity (35%), Cost-Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy (20%)).

This proposal puts forward an innovative approach to improving health outcomes for rural and low-income populations in Kentucky by tapping into the local wisdom and mores of local communities. This struck the review panel as a promising approach with greater promise than the typical, top-down urgings of health professionals. The review panel was also impressed by the phased approach the applicant proposed to take to its sub-granting, requiring grantees to go through a start-up period during which it would be required to demonstrate a sensitivity to the need for metrics and an ability to formulate a coherent and convincing line of attack. This seemed highly consistent with the objective of reaching into communities, where existing organizational capacities might not be fully developed at the outset. The review panel was also impressed by the clear commitment to evaluation evident in the proposal as manifested particularly in the partnership with a serious external evaluation organization and the allocation of substantial funds for the evaluation function. Some concerns were raised about the lack of experience in dealing with federal grants, the somewhat unclear plan for engaging technical assistance providers, and the limited funds made available for technical assistance activities. This latter seemed especially problematic in view of the heavy emphasis placed on technical assistance to these community-based sub-grantees in the narrative.

### II. Select one Band for this application (double-click in the applicable box and select "checked")

**Ensure that your selection is supported by your panel's Narrative Assessments, significant strengths and weaknesses, Ratings, and Overall Appraisal Statement. Take into consideration the weighting of each category.**

- ☐ **Band I (Excellent):** A comprehensive and thorough application of excellent merit with very significant strengths and no/minimal significant weaknesses.
- ☒ **Band II (Strong):** An application that demonstrates overall competence and is worthy of support, where the value of the significant strengths outweigh the identified weaknesses.
- ☐ **Band III (Satisfactory):** An application with potential, where strengths and weaknesses are approximately equal. However, some fundamental weaknesses have been identified.
- ☐ **Band IV (Weak/Non-Responsive):** An application with very significant weaknesses and no/minimal significant strengths that have been identified. This option may also include an application that is non-responsive to the published criteria.
- 

## Rank

As a panel, Rank this application in relation to the other applications on your panel. Complete this section only after all applications before your panel have been reviewed and consensus has been achieved on each one. The highest rank is "1".

Rank: 3 of 6 total applications on Panel # 14.

## CONSENSUS RUBRIC

Please use this Consensus Rubric as guidance when selecting your Ratings or Bands.

**BAND I (Excellent)** — *A BAND I rating reflects that the application is compelling, consistently excellent in quality, and addresses all requirements; thereby showing the highest potential for success.*

The **Excellent** application consistently:

- ✓ Goes beyond what was requested, showing that the applicant has anticipated issues that may arise.
- ✓ Provides a thorough, detailed response to all of the information requested.
- ✓ Provides a clear and highly compelling description of how the proposed activities will achieve the anticipated results.

- ✓ Provides clear evidence to support all objectives of this section (no assumptions are made).
- ✓ Supports ideas and objectives with comprehensive plans explaining and connecting ideas to objectives.

**BAND II (Strong)** — *A BAND II rating reflects that the application is solid, good-quality, and has great potential for success.*

The **Strong** application:

- ✓ Provides a response to all of the information requested.
- ✓ Provides a realistic description of how the proposed activities will achieve the anticipated results.
- ✓ Explains most assumptions and reasons.
- ✓ Supports ideas with comprehensive plans, examples, or outlines.

**BAND III (Satisfactory)** — *A BAND III rating reflects that the application generally meets requirements for a reasonable chance of success, but is neither especially strong nor especially weak.*

The **Satisfactory** application:

- ✓ Covers most of the information requested, with a few exceptions.
- ✓ Is sometimes unclear how the proposed activities will achieve the anticipated results.
- ✓ Makes some assumptions and leaves some reasons unexplained.
- ✓ Supports individual ideas with plans, examples, or outline.

**BAND IV (Weak/Non-responsive)** — *A weak/non-responsive rating reflects that the application is below standard especially in ability, skill, or quality; indicating that this application will most likely not succeed as described or is not responsive to the application requirements.*

The **Weak/Non-responsive** application:

- ✓ Does not provide one or more key pieces of requested information.
- ✓ Gives an unclear description of how the proposed activities will achieve the anticipated results.
- ✓ Gives many unsupported assumptions and reasons with little or no connection to objectives.
- ✓ Tends to "parrot" back the question, rather than answer and explain it
- ✓ Makes many assumptions and many reasons are not defined.
- ✓ Did not connect the activities to the anticipated results.
- ✓ Does not address or respond to the requirements/conditions of the NOFA.
- ✓ Proposes activities that are not consistent with the NOFA and application instructions.